

**REMARKS**

In light of the following remarks, reconsideration of the present application is requested. Claims 1-7, 10-16, 18, and 21-27 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is an independent claim. Claims 8, 9, 17, 19, and 20 are canceled. Claim 1 is amended.

**Examiner Interview**

Initially, the Applicants thank the Examiner for the polite and courteous interview conducted on January 12, 2010. During the interview, the Applicants and the Examiner discussed potential claims amendments for overcoming the cited art. During the Examiner interview, the Examiner acknowledged that none of the cited art teaches, suggests, or discloses "a baking system including a plate for receiving a wafer to be baked, a heater for heating the plate, and a cooling apparatus for cooling the plate, the cooling apparatus comprising...a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and **receiving** the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated," as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledged that such a feature is not obvious in light of the cited art. Accordingly, the Examiner agreed that if claim 1 was amended to recite the above feature, then claim 1 would not read on any of the cited art nor any combination thereof.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

I. Claims 1, 3-7, 12-16, 18, 21-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisai et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0192686) in view of

Hara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,413,167) and Emoto (U.S. Patent No. 7,064,804). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

In the Office Action, dated August 5, 2009, the Examiner asserted that Hisai discloses a baking system including a plate for receiving a wafer to be baked, a heater for heating the plate, and a cooling apparatus for cooling the plate. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner in the interview conducted on January 12, 2010, Hara's cooling apparatus does not include, at least, "a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants submit Hisai cannot be relied on for disclosing the instant feature.

In the Office Action dated August 5, 2009, the Examiner relied on Hara for disclosing the "coolant storage tank" recited in claim 1. In particular, the Examiner asserted the "coolant storage tank" recited in claim 1 reads on Hara's liquid tank 97. As illustrated in FIG. 9 of Hara's disclosure, the bottom of Hara's alleged liquid coolant storage tank 97 connects to an alleged heatpipe 91 via a pipe 96 for transferring operating fluid from the alleged coolant storage tank 97 to the alleged heatpipe 91. In Hara's disclosed arrangement, the liquid coolant flows from the alleged liquid coolant storage tank 97 to the alleged heatpipe 91. However, Hara does not disclose that the alleged liquid coolant storage tank 97 receives liquid coolant from the alleged heat pipe 91. Furthermore, the Examiner agreed that Hara cannot be relied on for teaching, suggesting, or disclosing, "a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated," as recited in claim 1. Therefore, during the Examiner interview, the Examiner agreed that even if one skilled in the art did combine Hisai with Hara, the combination would not disclose, at least, "a coolant storage tank

supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated,” as recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also referred to Emoto for disclosing various features associated with claim 1. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner in the Examiner interview, Emoto does not teach, suggest, or disclose “a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, even if one skilled in the art did combine Hisai, Hara, and Emoto (the combinability of which is not admitted), the combination would not disclose, at least, “a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants submit the combination of Hisai, Hara, and Emoto cannot be relied on for rendering claim 1 obvious.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request the rejections of claims 1, 3-7, 12-16, 18, 21-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the combination of Hisai, Hara, and Emoto be withdrawn.

II. Claims 2, 10, 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisai et al. as modified by Hara et al. as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Leffert (U.S. Patent No. 3,621,906). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

As noted above (and acknowledged by the Examiner during the Examiner interview), the combination of Hisai and Hara does not render claim 1 obvious at least because the combination fails to disclose “a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant

into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated,” as recited in claim 1. Additionally, the Applicants submit Leffert likewise fails to disclose the instant feature. Therefore, even if one skilled in the art did combine Hisai and Hara with Leffert, the combination would still not disclose “a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated,” as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants submit the combination of Hisai, Hara, and Leffert cannot be relied on for rendering claim 1 obvious. The Applicants further submit that claims 2, 10, 11 and 25 are likewise nonobvious over the combination of Hisai, Hara, and Leffert at least because of their dependencies on claim 1.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 2, 10, 11 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the combination of Hisai, Hara, and Leffert be withdrawn.

III. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisai et al. as modified by Hara et al. and Emoto as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Komino (JP-5315293).

As argued above, and acknowledged by the Examiner in the Examiner interview, claim 1 is nonobvious over the combination of Hisai, Hara, and Emoto at least because the combination does not teach, suggest, or disclose “a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated,” as recited in claim 1. Additionally, the Applicants submit Komino fails to cure this deficiency. Accordingly, even if one skilled in the art did combine the Hisai, Hara, Emoto, and Komino

references, the combination would not render claim 1 obvious at least because the combination would not disclose "a coolant storage tank supplying the coolant into the heatpipe when the plate is cooled and receiving the coolant supplied to the heatpipe when the plate is heated," as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the Applicants submit claim 27 is nonobvious over the combination of Hisai, Hara, Emoto, and Komino at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the combination of Hisai, Hara, Emoto and Komino be withdrawn.

**<Remainder of Page Intentionally Left Blank>**

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-7, 10-16, 18 and 21-27 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants petition for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply to the August 5, 2009 Office Action, and submit the required \$1,110.00 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNES, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JAC/DMB:eaf  
omb